DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 043 345 LI 002 135

AUTHOR Voigt, Melvin J.
TITLE Case Study of the California Experience in Library Collection Building.
INSTITUTION California Univ., San Diego. University Library.
SPONS AGENCY Bureau of Libraries and Educational Technology (DHEW/OE), Washington, D. C.
PUB DATE 69
NOTE 31p.; Paper prepared for the Institute on Acquisitions Procedures in Academic Libraries..., Aug 25-Sep 5, 1969

EDRS PRICE EDRS Price MF-$0.25 HC-$1.65
DESCRIPTORS *Case Studies, Institutes (Training Programs), *Library Acquisition, *Library Collections, *University Libraries

ABSTRACT

A variety of examples of collection development in a university system is provided by this case study. The University of California's nine campuses provide a wide variety of library acquisition experience. A retrospective view of their development reflects the changing pace and pattern of library collection building over the years. The University of California, San Diego (UCSD) development is interesting because the collection had immediate pressures of advanced graduate programs and UCSD had to use a variety of devices to meet specialized needs as they arose, while, at the same time, attempting to develop well-rounded basic collections for both undergraduates and graduate students. Development of each of the nine university libraries is traced using the following headings: (1) introduction, (2) the large campuses, (3) specialized institutional collections, (4) towards research--variations in patterns, (5) the problem of distribution and uniqueness, and (6) the UCSD experience. (NH)

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
OFFICE OF EDUCATION
THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL OFFICE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY.

ED043345

Institute on

ACQUISITIONS PROCEDURES IN ACADEMIC LIBRARIES

sponsored by
The University Library
University of California, San Diego*

August 25 - September 5, 1969

CASE STUDY OF THE CALIFORNIA EXPERIENCE IN LIBRARY COLLECTION BUILDING

by

Melvin J. Voigt
University Librarian
University of California, San Diego

LI 002135

*Conducted under a grant from the U.S. Office of Education, Title II-B, Higher Education Act of 1965, P.L. 89-329, as amended.

I. Introduction

This case study is intended to provide a variety of examples of collection development in a university system. There has been no attempt at a balanced view of the total system or to give equal emphasis to each of the campus libraries and their acquisition programs. Rather, the study is based on the writer's experience during seven years as Assistant Librarian at UCB and almost nine years as University Librarian at UCSD, thus emphasizing those two campuses and particularly the latter, in which a major share of staff activity has been in the collection development process.

The University's nine campuses provide a wide variety of library acquisition experience. A retrospective view of their development reflects the changing pace and pattern of library collection building during the years. Berkeley's one-hundred-year history includes a long period when libraries grew slowly. Only in recent years has UCB picked up an acquisition pace which reflects in any measure the accelerated rate of publishing and the requirements of modern scholarship. UCLA, with a much shorter history, began during a period when growth rates had not increased greatly and the needs of scholarship on a second campus were only dimly recognized. When these needs were recognized the change was dramatic. Several other campuses have relatively long histories as specialized institutions with rather slow shifts toward general universities. Only recently have they begun to move rapidly toward becoming useful research libraries. The three

newest general campuses show interesting variations. UCSD, because it grew out of a specialized institution, because it started with and emphasized very high level graduate work and research, and because of its isolated location distant from any research library, has developed rapidly. UCI began graduate programs early and was able to show the need for research collections within a few years of its opening. UCSC has emphasized undergraduate instruction and has moved much more slowly in developing research collections.

The difference in rate of growth during the early years of each of the campuses reveals clearly the difference in scholarship, publishing, and dependence on libraries which has occurred during the University's one-hundred-year history. The UCB Library took 50 years to reach 400,000 volumes; the UCLA Library, less than 25 years; and the UCSD Library, 7 years. The average yearly growth of the UCB Library was 8,000 volumes per year during the first 50 years and 64,600 volumes per year during the second 50 years. The rate now is approximately 150,000 per year. At UCLA the average growth was 18,000 volumes per year during the first 25 years and 92,000 per year during the second 25 years.

The UCSD development is interesting because the collection had immediate pressures of advanced graduate programs and had to use a variety of devices to meet specialized needs as they arose, while at the same time attempting to develop well-rounded basic collections for both undergraduates and graduate students.

II. The Large Campuses

University of California, Berkeley

The UCB Library is a good example of the systematic development of a major library over a relatively long period of time. Many notable collections in specialized areas were obtained, especially as new subject fields were opened, but most of the books have come item-by-item through purchase or exchange. As the new subject fields became prominent, such as art history or music, special appropriations were made from book budgets, desiderata lists were put together, and, when possible, exchange relations were developed.

Even the oldest of the UC libraries is relatively young, especially as a major research library. As a youthful library it demonstrates a factor in collection development which will be noted in all of the other campus libraries as well as in institutions elsewhere. This is the relative ease with which an adequate research library can be developed in the sciences as compared to the humanities. The following paragraphs from "Expansion and Change," the 1956/57 Annual Report of UC's Library Council, discuss these differences and the problem in the humanities. (University of California. Library Council, 1957.)

> The libraries at Berkeley and Los Angeles have done well in supporting the physical and biological sciences, because their essential literature comes in the form of journals. The titles which make up a good science collection are easily determinable; these journals are generally useful to all who do

research in the subject areas covered; most of them are relatively recent and the number of older journals that had to be acquired was not great; the University has maintained a strong exchange program which has simplified the acquisition of academy and society publications.

In the humanities and social sciences, the problem of developing collections to meet expanding research needs is quite different. Research materials in these fields take a variety of forms but include manuscripts, early editions of literary works, government archives, newspapers, labor publications, private correspondence, and the like. In these fields, most of the retrospective and current buying must be in the interests of current research needs.

As faculty are replaced or augmented, the libraries are faced with new demands, not for material in new fields as much as for material in the parts of old fields not previously subjected to scholarly study at the University. The libraries must be flexible and adaptable. They must be ready to shift direction quickly to meet the needs and pressures of today's faculty, which differ from those of yesterday's faculty and will be changed in turn by new research interests tomorrow. In maintaining this flexibility, there is necessarily a conflict between a slowly growing collection with a planned program of development and the speedier shifts of scholarship. The libraries must overcome their disabilities to provide for the library users of the future as well as for the needs of the present.

The development of the Slavic collections as described by Coney and Michel (1966) illustrates well one of the best methods for starting the development of a major research collection in a specialized field. Acquisition of private collections of individual scholars is almost essential at the beginning or in the early stages, although the scarcity of such collections severely limits the possibilities for useful purchases in the future. Occasionally, valuable collections can be obtained through book dealers, but many libraries have squandered book funds on collections which have little

relation to scholarly needs, collections made up by some book dealers from books in their possession or obtained at random. A scholar's private collection has many advantages in that the owner almost invariably has put his money in books which he needed for his own scholarly use. Thus, if the subject is appropriate, a university library is able to obtain, in one purchase, a scholarly collection of useful materials, one which, in many cases, could be duplicated, if at all, only with a great deal of effort over a long period of time. The depth and breadth will, of course, vary. The problem is that such collections are few and are in great demand. The secret at Berkeley, in the case of the Slavic collections, was that there were at UCB top-ranking scholars who were among the first to know of the availability of such collections. As a result, the books were at Berkeley before other institutions learned of their existence. That this procedure works today will be shown in the last section of this paper.

In the case of the Slavic collections at Berkeley, exchanges played a very important role. Exchanges will continue to play an important role in collection development for older institutions where long-term agreements exist. For newer institutions, even those fortunate enough to have material available for exchange, they are becoming decreasingly useful. The personnel costs of establishing and maintaining exchanges are high, and universities are publishing less in the scholarly series which have been the backbone of exchange programs.

Coney and Michel (1966) also describe the development of the Music Library at UCB. Here again, collections obtained because faculty members and librarians discovered their availability played a major part. In this case, other unique materials could be obtained only by utilization of microfilm. It should be noted, however, that the material to be filmed was selected by scholars who knew what was important to the work at Berkeley and were able to create an important archive of material without large expenditures.

In other areas, microfilming is even more important in creating a major research facility. The filming of the Latin American source materials in the Spanish and Mexican archives and the British Public Record office added tremendously to the richness of the Bancroft Library.

It is obvious that as a collection grows, the possibility of purchasing useful collections without a high percentage of duplication decreases. Except for very specialized collections, such as those which make up the East Asiatic Library, UCB has done relatively little collection buying in recent years. On the other hand, the reputation of the University and the Library have brought it a number of very important specialized gift collections such as the Beatrix Farrand horticulture and landscape design collection. Manuscript collections do not have the problem of duplication, and UCB has continued to obtain many important collections through the years.

Acquisition of collections is, of course, only the beginning and the easiest part for the acquisition librarian. In these examples at Berkeley the acquisition of collections was followed by a continuing process of selecting the materials needed to round out the subject coverage and to expand it as new areas became of interest to the scholarly users of the Library.

In most cases the development of outstanding collections took place over relatively long periods of time. In almost every instance searching continues for individual o.p. items. Various devices have been used to obtain the desired volumes; faculty and staff members were sent on buying trips, dealers' catalogs were checked against desiderata lists, and specialized lists were sent to o.p. dealers and search services. Recent experience at Berkeley indicates that, both in terms of cost and in effectiveness in obtaining needed titles, best results can be obtained by using dealers and searching agencies (Smith, 1968). Smith reports that while the cost per title was lower when ordering from catalogs (20 percent lower in a 1967 study, 10 percent in a 1964 study), "the extensive checking involved in catalog ordering required an investment of approximately six times the labor cost per order that was necessary to acquire an item by quotation." If the higher cancellation ratio for orders from catalogs was taken into account, the difference was even greater.

University of California, Los Angeles

Few libraries have achieved major research library status as rapidly as UCLA. While the Library's history goes back to 1881 and the founding of the Los Angeles State Normal School, its beginnings as a university date only to 1919, when the Normal School became the University's Southern Branch. Even after the graduate division was organized in 1933, the collection continued to be affected by an earlier decision to hold its size to 200,000 volumes. Only in recent years has there been official approval of a growth rate comparable to that at UCB. By 1944 the collection had reached 462,000 volumes, and during the next 17 years, under Lawrence Clark Powell's dynamic leadership, the collection grew to more than a million and a half. Since 1961 the growth rate has continued upward, resulting in the addition of 1,200,000 volumes in eight years and a total of 2,750,000 in June, 1969. There is no doubt that the UCLA experience, which showed clearly that the campus could not become a major university until it had a useable research library, has assisted the other campuses in that decisions were made early in their development that basic research collections were essential.

Two recent contributions of the UCLA Library to collection development practices should be noted. Almost all university and college libraries have seen a tendency away from faculty selection toward selection by library staff. O'Brien (1966) reports that "with the growth of the Library, increasing committee work, administrative duties and the pace research, the faculty

found book selection an increasing burden, and by 1958 or 1959 it was clear that even in the fields of social sciences and humanities the faculty was anxious to have selection responsibility assumed by the Library." O'Brien goes on to describe the establishment of a corps of bibliographers "who are selection specialists in subject, geographical, language, or cultural areas, with responsibility, on a continuing basis for assessing the Library's collections and for the selection of materials to improve the Library's research resources." In 1966 there were eleven bibliographers. (This topic will be discussed in connection with G.A. Harrer's paper on the subject.)

The second contribution of the UCLA Library has been the large-scale use of blanket orders for obtaining current publications from many countries of the world. The system is also described by O'Brien (1966). At that time, blanket orders were in effect for thirty-seven countries. While blanket orders have been used effectively by the Library of Congress for many years, the UCLA experience probably represents the widest use of this system in a university library. Blanket orders are now being used by a number of the libraries on the smaller campuses with considerable success. Whether they can be useful for libraries which normally obtain relatively few books from a foreign country has not been proved and would likely relate to the possibility of a closely defined statement of the breadth of requirements as well as to the ability of the foreign agent to interpret the "library's profile". Some

libraries use a modified blanket plan in which the foreign agent checks issues of the national bibliography, noting the titles he proposes to send on the blanket order, but holding them for confirmation. (Blanket orders are included in David Lane's paper and will be considered later.)

Other aspects of UCLA's acquisition program are described in some detail in O'Brien's (1966) article.

III. The Specialized Institutional Collections

Three of the general campuses of the University grew out of specialized campuses or agencies. These have been maintained and expanded as the University's major collections in the fields covered.

The oldest of these is the collection in agriculture at UC Davis which began in 1908. The collection grew very slowly and, similarly to the general collections at UCB and UCLA, showed rapid growth only in recent years. In 1951, when the College of Letters and Science was established, there were only 80,000 volumes in the UCD Library, 80 percent in agriculture and the biological sciences (Blanchard, 1968). As research in agriculture and veterinary medicine broadened its base further into the biological and physical sciences, these related collections grew rapidly.

The Scripps Institution of Oceanography at UCSD became a part of the University in 1913. Its collections, which are growing at the rate of 6,000 volumes per year, have doubled in size in less than 10 years, and the number of volumes added per year has quadrupled in that period. The two

factors which have caused this dramatic increase are (1) the rapid expansion of research in oceanography around the world, and (2) the broadening of the research of oceanography to include much more chemistry, physics, mathematics, geology, biology, and engineering than had been true in earlier years.

At Riverside, the Citrus Experiment Station had a comprehensive collection in its specialty and strength in the general field of subtropical horticulture. Because the general campus at UCR began as an undergraduate institution and because the Experiment Station's specialization is rather narrow, the two collections have had less relationship than do the specialized and general collections at UCD and UCSD.

At San Francisco, the Medical Center has developed a comprehensive collection in medicine and related fields, totaling more than 350,000 volumes. These collections include large percentages of books and journals in the natural sciences, as do most medical libraries. The trend toward "biomedical" libraries, such as those at UCLA, UCSD, and UCD, represents efforts to avoid large-scale duplication and at the same time provides broad coverage for the many inter-disciplinary areas of modern medicine.

IV. Towards Research - Variations in Patterns

The six general campuses of the University now in various stages of growth, and often referred to as "emerging" campuses, show interesting variations in library development. Santa Barbara and Riverside followed

the pattern of many universities, starting as undergraduate colleges and gradually moving into graduate work and advanced research. There was enough time to create basic collections in a systematic way and to move toward specialized research materials subject-by-subject as the need arose. Both are relatively close to UCLA and faculty and graduate students can use that library effectively while the research collections on their own campuses are being developed. Many of the institutions represented at this conference have or have had similar patterns of campus development. Since priorities in the use of the normally limited funds are of considerable importance in such situations, it is essential that the library have very close rapport with faculty if immediate needs are to be met without losing track of long-term requirements of balance.

The growth and development pattern at UCSD presented more problems and probably more opportunities than at most universities. Senior faculty members in most disciplines came from the country's major institutions where they were accustomed to excellent research libraries. They often brought their graduate students and on-going research programs with them, resulting in instant PhD and post-doctoral programs and demands for instant research collections. While UCLA and UCB could and did help, the distance, even to UCLA, is too great for effective use, even on a temporary basis. The opportunity for rapid library development has been great, at least to the extent that book funds were available. The Chancellors who have served this campus

have been strong in their support of the library and outspoken in emphasizing that the University's greatness depends in large part on the Library. This commitment is strongly stated in the talk Chancellor John Galbraith gave at the San Francisco conference of the ALA in 1967 (Galbraith, 1968). UCSD was fortunate to be able to develop a basic collection at the undergraduate level at the same time that it was building both basic and specialized research collections. Evidence from new faculty members as they arrive on campus and from the extensive use the collection receives from faculty of educational institutions in the area, as well as from scholars coming from elsewhere to use the specialized collections, indicates that the Library has been successful, even though it is realized that there is a long distance to go before reaching major research library status.

UCSD is developing as a series of colleges spread over a large campus. With undergraduate study and graduate and research programs in a broad spectrum of subject fields in each college of from 2,000 to 3,000 students, the planning of effective library facilities and collections has been a long-term project. From an acquisition point of view, the most important question has been the distribution of undergraduate libraries. Realizing that State funds would not be adequate to provide undergraduate libraries which would be useful in any sense in each of the twelve colleges, and knowing that a single undergraduate library would be less than ideal for students scattered over a large campus, the concept of cluster libraries was developed. These libraries in

"cluster centers", surrounded by a group of colleges, are planned for 50,000 to 60,000 volumes. It is believed that collections of this size can provide for about 70 percent of undergraduate students' need if they are well chosen and kept up-to-date. The first of these, in temporary quarters, is doing an amazing amount of business even though the collection has reached only about 20,000 volumes.

At Santa Cruz, the college system is quite different, with some twenty small undergraduate colleges planned, and with a graduate program with its own centrally located buildings. At UCSC, the undergraduate students will be expected to make a greater use of the Central Library. However, small libraries are being planned for each college, the facilities and books for these libraries to come from non-budgetary funds. Whether enough funding can be obtained to make these more than study-halls is an unanswered question at this time.

The Library at Irvine follows the centralized pattern of the campus. Libraries are centralized, with collections for branch libraries for Physical Sciences-Engineering and Biomedicine under development.

At Davis, the campus has profited from the existence of advanced graduate programs in agriculture and related fields. As new programs were introduced in the humanities and the sciences, efforts were made to bring these rapidly to levels of the existing departments. To do this, library collections were needed and special emphasis was placed on collection development, first in the sciences and later in the humanities.

V. The Problem of Distribution and Uniqueness

The University of California has the problem which is faced by every multiple campus system, developing resources adequate for graduate work on each campus vs. the need to bring the total resources of the system to the highest possible level. With a scarcity of good research libraries in the area there has always been a unanimity of opinion on the principle that the system should emphasize total resources rather than attempting to duplicate collections on each campus. With two major libraries in existence by 1960, it was natural that in a ten-year plan approved in 1961, UCB and UCLA were to be the two great research libraries. The plan, however, limited the two libraries to three million volumes each, with the excess to go into two regional storage libraries. The other campuses existing at the time were to reach 500,000 volumes in ten years. By the time the plan had reached its fifth year it was clear that the sights had been set much too low. The growth rates proposed for UCB and UCLA were not high enough to keep up with increases in publication rates and the broadening of scholarship. These libraries would fall far behind the other great libraries in the country if the 3,000,000 limitation was retained and if growth rates were not increased. But on the other campuses, including the three which began operation as general campuses after 1961, it was clear that the 500,000 volumes proposed for 1971 was inadequate to meet their research needs and that, if these campuses were to be equally as attractive as UCB and UCLA for faculty and

scholars, an objective of the University's Regents, much larger collections would be necessary. Both the 3,000,000 limitation on UCB and UCLA and the half-million objectives were removed by 1967 or 1968, but this has not solved the problem. Statewide distribution of book funds is a major problem which involves not only the University but the seventeen State colleges as well, for book funds for both systems come primarily from legislative action.

There are those who argue that the Clapp-Jordan approach (Clapp, V.W., and Jordan, R.T., 1965) should be used. (See also Blanchard, 1968.) This system, if applied to a group of university campuses with equal numbers of students at all levels, equal numbers of departments and doctoral programs, and equal numbers of professional programs, as will be true on most of the UC campuses within about twenty years, would result in libraries of the same size. This would be fine if funds were unlimited, duplication could be disregarded, and each of the eight libraries could reach say, six million volumes twenty years from now. These possibilities seem most unlikely. If the formula approach is used it must be assumed that eventually there would be equality, or close to it, in size if not quality. To provide the maximum resources for the State, there would have to be very strict controls over duplication. No one knows how to devise or enforce such controls. Major collecting areas would have to be reassigned to the various campuses, a procedure which UCB and UCLA could hardly be expected to agree to. Viewed realistically, it seems clear to this writer that the result could only

be eight mediocre libraries, with a great deal of duplication of relatively little used material.

An alternative is to reinforce the earlier objective, by making the continued development of the UCB and UCLA libraries the number one priority, allowing their growth rates to increase at least as rapidly as the major libraries in other parts of the country. However, these two libraries cannot carry the load for the entire State. Under the State's Master Plan, the University's Libraries are to be California's major research libraries and are to provide borrowing service to the faculties of other institutions of higher education. Reference, interlibrary, or borrowing use is provided for students and for industry and for the State's citizens. UCLA, serving the educational institutions, industrial concerns, and individual users in a population area of more than twelve million cannot carry the load no matter how large its collection. This is true at UCB to a lesser degree for its area. Metropolitan areas are developing rapidly outside the Los Angeles and Bay areas, of which San Diego with 1,500,000 population today is the largest. Distance, as mentioned earlier, also puts San Diego at a great disadvantage. The plan then would have to have a provision which would allow one campus in the south and possibly one in the north to develop at a faster rate to help carry the load for a rapidly growing state. That such a proposal is not greeted with uniform enthusiasm throughout the system should be obvious. There is also a good deal of pressure from the Statewide budget office and

from Sacramento toward simple numerical formulas which are easy to apply and which will make budget justification simple. Thus, it is far from certain whether the libraries of the University will follow what some of us believe to be a suicidal route to mediocrity or whether the University will insist on maintaining a smaller number of truly great libraries.

If the above proposal gains even partial acceptance, it leaves many problems unsolved. What should be the nature of the research collections on other campuses? One possibility would be to use a formula approach for these campuses and to use instead, comparison with other major libraries as the yardstick for the major research collections. Unless more can be done to make the major collections more easily accessible to users on other campuses, there will always be demands for equality. Perhaps facsimile will help. Today, faculty and graduate students are finding it difficult to obtain the materials they need at the much over-used UCLA Library. This is true of users from UCLA itself as well as those coming from the other campuses. Probably the most difficult problem is the one libraries have struggled with unsuccessfully for years, how to avoid duplicating little used materials. With each campus having considerable independence in determining its areas of subject concentration, and with every campus planning to offer advanced work in most of the expected fields, there is little likelihood that subject limitations will serve as controls except in certain professional school areas. Until a method is found to apply cost-benefit analyses to the

contribution of the library to the university, it will continue to be difficult to determine how much of a university's funding should go for library collections. (See Munn, 1968.)

All of the campuses have at least occasional opportunities to obtain specialized collections which may or may not fit well into their academic programs. Under faculty pressure, it would take an unusual librarian to suggest that the collection go to another campus - although there have been a few such examples. There is, of course, a good deal of exchange of duplicates which has been particularly valuable to the newer campuses.

There have been two major examples of statewide purchases with distribution of the books to all or to a number of the campuses. The purchases of the C.K. Ogden collection in 1957, with the books going to all campuses through a selection system managed at UCLA, and the Isaac Foot Library, with most of the collection divided by the UCSB, UCD, and UCR Libraries, have often been cited as examples of cooperative purchasing. The size and variety of these collections did present excellent opportunities for the University. The problems of distribution of these large collections among the UC Libraries is discussed by Silver (1965).

Through the Library Council, made up of the University Librarians, Deans of the Library Schools, Director of the Institute of Library Research, Chairman of the Statewide Senate Library Committee, and a representative of the President, some progress has been made in facilitating intercampus use. The Council was also responsible for the proposal to print the UCB and

UCLA catalogs, a project funded by the Regents. Recently, a sub-committee has began to look into possibilities of multiple purchases of large sets, reprints, etc., and to possible discounts through agreements for purchases from certain dealers by all campuses. Other than this, there has been no serious consideration for joint or coordinated purchasing. The only exception to this has been the New Campuses Program which is discussed briefly in the following section.

VI. The UCSD Experience

The expansion of the library collection at UCSD from the 35,000 volumes in the Scripps Institution of Oceanography Library in 1900 to the 625,000 volumes today may be of interest because of the various types of collections which had to be developed and the procedures which were used to create relatively useful research collections in such a short period of time.

The Scientific Research Collections

When the decision was made in 1959 to develop a general campus at UCSD, it was also decided that the first programs would be advanced graduate work in the physical sciences. As a result, the first library assignment was the creation of a strong research collection in these subject fields. Lists of desired journals were compiled using standard lists, results of citation studies, faculty recommendations, and lists which the writer had used in a somewhat similar assignment at Carnegie Institute of Technology some years

earlier. Most of the journals were obtained by submitting lists to back-file dealers although a few came from collection purchases and acquisition of sets from individuals. A comparison with similar purchases some twelve years earlier showed, surprisingly, that availability had decreased very little and that prices were 50 to 75 percent higher. Sets which had become scarce or unavailable as originals were in large part available as reprints.

At the same time, extensive checking was done of monographs listed in Books in Print and copies were made of UCB shelflists in certain fields to assist in rapid development of the monograph collection.

When the Medical School was authorized a few years later, an immediate start was made in building a collection for the Biomedical Library, with the intent of having 70,000 volumes on hand when the school opened in 1968. Much the same methods were used to select the journal collection, and some 2,400 current subscriptions were placed. Monograph ordering was deferred for most titles until the year prior to opening so that latest editions would be available. In Fall 1968, when the School of Medicine admitted its first class, there were 70,000 volumes in the Biomedical Library and the branch in University Hospital.

The New-Campuses Program and Undergraduate Libraries

In the first year of general campus development it was clear that a start should be made on a general collection which could serve as a base for the graduate collections in the humanities and social sciences even though there would be no undergraduate students until 1965. As a device for obtaining funds for such a collection and to assist the other two new campuses in

starting on their collections, a proposal was made for a project to select, order, and catalog three identical 75,000 volume collections at UCSD. When we were able to demonstrate that some $400,000 could be saved in processing costs over the costs of developing each collection separately, the Statewide Administration and the Regents were willing to appropriate special funds and to seek additional state funds for the project. At the end of the four year project, it turned out that the estimates were very close to actual costs. The rationale, procedure for selection and processing, and considerations which went into publishing what is now referred to as BCL (Books for College Libraries, ALA. 1966) are described in the article by Voigt and Treyz (1965) and will not be repeated here.

The collections developed under NCP have been used by all three campuses as a base for research collections rather than as undergraduate collections. The first of UCSD's Cluster (undergraduate) Libraries has been in existence for two years. Selection for its collection uses BCL, Choice, and the Library's approval plan, with priorities related closely to academic programs in Revelle and Muir Colleges, the first two of UCSD's proposed twelve colleges.

Basic Research Collections for the Humanities and Social Sciences

It is never possible to draw a distinct line between an undergraduate collection and graduate or research collections. The selections for the New Campuses Program when viewed by prospective faculty members and by

reviewers were felt by many to be almost strong enough for masters degree programs in some fields. However, a basic research collection which will provide the fundamental material necessary for scholarly research goes far beyond the collections put together by NCP. As is noted in the next section, many of the books essential for research came to UCSD through the acquisition of important collections. Collections inevitably result in uneveness, providing hills or mountains but leaving valleys in between which must be filled up to some intermediate level if the library is to be useful. In subject areas in which useful collections cannot be found, the library must select and obtain books on a broader base to bring the collections to the threshold of research capability. This is certainly the most difficult job in any library and the UCSD experience can probably add little to what is done elsewhere. The selection method which has been most fruitful has been the checking of bibliographies in standard bibliographies, text books, and reference works such as the International Encyclopedia of the Social Sciences. However, this needs to be done by staff members who have considerable subject competence if the results are to be useful. Quality of the selection is obviously of great importance in all aspects of library collection development. The pay-off in maximum usefulness is probably most evident in the selection of the basic research collection in the humanities and social sciences. Not every library will be as fortunate as UCSD in having a Carl White available. Experience here indicates that this is a better selection method than checking dealers' catalogs

when a basic research collection is the desired result. The dealer's catalog will often supply items which are difficult to find by other means, but librarians and faculty members alike tend to think beyond the basic research collection when reading a catalog, resulting often in the acquisition of good research material, but at the expense of the objective - a basic collection. Because subject specialists are needed in both reference and collection development, and at this stage we cannot afford them in both, UCSD plans to follow the practice of several other libraries in putting subject bibliographers in the Reference Department, to combine public service with selection. This plan should also result in a closer relationship between the bibliographers and the faculty and graduate students and in selection more closely related to immediate needs.

For libraries which have not developed automated acquisitions systems but have computer facilities available, a simple computerized desiderata system can be developed which allows for want-list outputs within combinations of desired categories such as date, subject, language, form, etc.

Little has been said concerning acquisition of new books. An approval system has been used at UCSD for six years for American books and more recently for British. Blanket order plans are operative for Germany, France, Spain, and Italy and will be extended to other countries in the near future.

For serials acquisition in the humanities and social sciences there is no substitute for knowledge of the publications and their use. With such experience it is possible to develop priority lists for both current subscriptions and for back files.

Specialized Research Collections

Much of a university library's attractiveness for scholars comes from the research collections which allow for scholarly work in depth. Since no one library can have more than a small fraction of these materials, it is expected that few scholars can do all of their work at one university if extensive use of library materials is involved. Yet, unless an institution has developed outstanding specializations and is able to obtain others when opportunity offers, it will have difficulty in recruiting.

Most new institutions will have little opportunity to attract significant manuscript and archival collections and can only hope to do so when their reputations start to build. To collect specialized research material in book form through dealer's catalogs and want lists is a slow process but may be the most practical and perhaps the only method for many institutions.

A good deal was said earlier about the desirability and importance of obtaining specialized collections. It may be of interest, through a list of the most significant collections obtained at UCSD in recent years, to illustrate how important faculty knowledge of the existence and availability of these collections is.

Laurence Huey Collection in Ornithology and Mammalogy
2,000 volumes, primarily in ornithology.
(Library contacted by owner at suggestion of a UCSD faculty member)

H.P. Robertson Collection
Scientific books and periodicals.
(Library contacted owner at suggestion of a UCSD faculty member)

Calderon Collection
A fine collection of several thousand volumes on Latin America.
(University Librarian-Dealer contact)

Christensen Collection of Civil War Material
A general collection on the Civil War.
(Library contacted by owner at suggestion of a UCLA faculty member)

Américo Castro Collection
A magnificent collection of approximately 9,000 volumes of material primarily on Spanish literature, culture, and history.
(Obtained as the result of personal friendship of a UCSD faculty member)

D.H. Lawrence Collection
Several hundred volumes of first and other editions and commentary.
(Known to be available from dealer by a UCSD faculty member)

Martinez Lopez Collection
500 volumes in Spanish literature.
(Library contacted owner at suggestion of a UCSD faculty member)

O' Neill Collection
14,000 volumes of American and English literature including many standard works in important first editions.
(Availability reported to a UCSD faculty member by a colleague at his former institution)

L. de Santis Collection
1,400 items on French history and literature.
(Library-Dealer contact)

D.H. Heffner Collection
750 volumes on Classical language and literature and civilization.
(Library-Dealer contact)

Ernest Hemingway Collection
First and other editions of Ernest Hemingway.
(Known to be available from dealer by a UCSD faculty member)

Iverson Harris Library
A gift of 2,000 volumes of materials relating to the Theosophical movement, particularly the Point Loma Theosophical Society.
(Gift to UCSD suggested by local friend of owner)

R. Ellis Roberts Collection
12,000 volumes of English literature and criticism.
(University Librarian-Dealer contact)

Hoepli Reference Library
Reference works and bibliography.
(Joint purchase at suggestion of UCLA Library)

Koppel S. Pinson Collection
2,200 volumes in German and modern Jewish history.
(Library contacted owner at suggestion of a UCSD faculty member)

Manuel Pedroso Collection
2,300 volumes in Mexican and Spanish literature and history.
(Library contacted owner at suggestion of a UCSD faculty member)

Lewent Collection in Romance Philology
200 reference works.
(Library contacted owner at suggestion of a UCSD faculty member)

History of the Netherlands
738 volumes on Dutch history.
(Library-Dealer contact)

Don Cameron Allen Renaissance Library
1,500 sixteenth and seventeenth century books and several thousand later books.
(Obtained as the result of personal friendship of a UCSD faculty member)

Southworth Spanish Civil War Collection
7,500 items on the Spanish Civil War.
(Library contacted owner at suggestion of a UCSD faculty member)

José Miranda Collection
5,000 volumes on Latin American history and anthropology.
(Library contacted owner at suggestion of a UCSD faculty member)

Jocelyn Brooks Collection
Personal library of the English writer.
(Library staff member-Dealer contact)

Icelandic Literature
A collection of 600 titles.
(Library-Dealer contact)

Della Vida Collection
Near Eastern literature, culture, and language.
(Possible availability reported to a UCSD faculty member by a colleague at another institution)

Dyk Collection
The gift of a UC Berkeley alumnus on geophysics and petroleum geology.
(Gift to UCSD suggested by UCB)

Romero Library
Spanish and European culture and literature.
(Library finalized purchase after correspondence between owner and a UCSD faculty member)

Luskin Collection
History of aeronautics.
(Availability reported to UCSD Library staff member by a UCSD non-academic staff member)

Weinreich Collection
Slavic and general linguistics.
(Library contacted owner at suggestion of a UCSD faculty member)

Maria y Campos Collection
Several hundred titles in Spanish history.
(Library contacted owner at suggestion of a UCSD faculty member)

Alvaro Jara Collection
Chilean history.
(Library contacted owner at suggestion of a UCSD faculty member)

The job at UCSD now is to fill in around these collections, to develop the library in areas not covered by collection acquisitions, to broaden the base in terms of new subject fields, to broaden where necessary the acquisition of currently published materials, and to obtain selectively through microforms, materials essential to the campus scholars' research needs.

Bibliography

Blanchard, J.R. (1968). Planning the conversion of a college to a university library. College and Research Libraries 29, 297-302.

Clapp, V.W., and Jordan, R.T. (1965). Quantitative criteria for adequacy of academic library collections. College and Research Libraries 26, 371-380.

Coney, D., and Michel, J.G. (1966). The Berkeley Library of the University of California: Some notes on its formation. Library Trends 15, 286-302.

Cushman, J. (1967). Instant college libraries: The University of California's new campuses at Santa Cruz and Irivne. Library Journal 92, 540-543.

Galbraith, J.S. (1968). "A Historian's Viewpoint on University Libraries." Friends of the Library, UCSD. 12p.

Haro, R.P. (1969). Some problems in the conversion of a college to a university library. College and Research Libraries 30, 260-264.

"Libraries of the University of California." (1964). 93p.

Munn, R.F. (1968). The bottomless pit, or the academic library as viewed from the administration building. College and Research Libraries 29, 51-54.

O' Brien, R. (1966). Nine campuses, one university: the libraries of the University of California. Library Trends 15, 303-320.

Silver, C.H. (1965). Multi-campus distribution of purchased libraries. College and Research Libraries 26, 241-249.

Smith, E. (1968). Out-of-print booksearching. College and Research Libraries 29, 303-309.

University of California, Library Council (1957). "Expansion and Change, Annual Report of the Libraries of the University of California, 1956/57."

Voigt, M.J., and Treyz, J.H. (1965). The New Campuses Program. Library Journal 90, 2204-2208.